

E 668

.T24

Copy 1

E
668
T24



Library of Congress.

Chap. E 668

Shelf T 24

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

AN ADDRESS
TO THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN KENTUCKY,
AND OTHER LOYAL STATES,
IN REGARD TO THE
TREATMENT OF CHURCH-MEMBERS
WHO HAVE BEEN ENGAGED IN THE REBELLION.

BY JOHN TAFFE, M. D.,
Late Chaplain of the 11th Kentucky Cavalry.



CINCINNATI:
H. S. BOSWORTH, PRINT.
1866.

E668

.T24

TO THE READER.

The following pages were written, not with a view to destroy, but to save, if *possible*, by leading the guilty to repentance—to induce the Churches to take proper action in the premises; and to contribute somewhat to the diffusion of a healthy loyal sentiment throughout the country.

BY THE AUTHOR.

A D D R E S S .

What should the Churches of Christ, in Kentucky and other loyal States, do with their returned members, who have been in the armies and councils of the Southern Confederacy or elsewhere—aiding and abetting in the effort to overthrow the Government of the United States and dismember the Republic?

Let no one take counsel of passion or prejudice in the decision of this question. These are unsafe counsellors. The ears of passion are too dull to hear the voice of reason and of truth, amid the noisy din and senseless clamor, with which she is ever surrounded; and the eyes of prejudice too feeble to see the truth through the thick veil that ever covers her face.

Let these both alike, then, be excluded from the forum, the jury box and the judicial bench, and let reason, in the clear light of the word of God, and of the embodied wisdom and judgment of mankind, decide the question. Let no considerations but the interests of Zion, the good of those involved in the question, the good of the churches and our common country, be mixed up in the decision of this momentous question. Let us remember that the eyes of the allwise and beneficent Ruler of the universe are

upon us—penetrating the deep recesses of our hearts and all the secret springs of our conduct, and that to Him we must give an account on the great day of retribution.

What are the divine injunctions bearing upon this subject, as they came from the lips of the Great Messiah, and from the pens of His inspired apostles? When the chief priests and scribes, to tempt the Messiah, asked him if it were lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar, He called for a penny: "Whose image and superscription hath it?" saith He. They answer, "Cæsar's." And He said to them, "*render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's.*"—Luke xx: 19–20.

Here Jesus enjoins upon the Jews not only the payment of tribute to Cæsar, but the faithful discharge of every duty which they owed to Cæsar and to God. He enjoins upon them loyalty in its highest and most comprehensive sense—making their obligation to obey the laws and edicts of Cæsar absolute and imperative, save and except (by implication), in those cases in which the commands of Cæsar might be in contravention to the laws of God; in which cases it was their duty to obey God rather than man, and to take the consequences; but in no instance does He license them to raise their arms to resist or to strike down the government of Cæsar.

Judea had been conquered by the Roman arms,

and had become a Roman province. Cæsar was only another name for the Roman emperor who then swayed a scepter over the civilized world. His jurisdiction over the Jews had been acquired by conquest, and yet Jesus enjoins obedience to his authority in the clearest and most emphatic language. Obedience, then, to Cæsar was obedience to God (save and except in those cases in which the laws of Cæsar might be in derogation of the Divine law), and to resist the authority of Cæsar was to resist the authority of God himself—for He has ordained political governments, and clothed them with the high sanction of His authority. Jesus, therefore, in His answer to the chief priests and scribes, only enjoins upon them duties which had been always binding upon them from the very relation which they sustained to Cæsar and to God. To the one as the ruler of the Roman empire, and to the other as the great ruler of the universe.

If, then, the obligation of the Jew to submit to the government of Cæsar was thus imperative, though his authority had been acquired by conquest over the chosen people of God, how much stronger is the obligation of Christians to submit to the government of the United States, instituted by the American people themselves, for the preservation of the great heritage of freedom for themselves and posterity, in all time to come! and how dreadful the sin committed by them against God and the American people, in raising their arms and aiding and abetting in the

effort that has been made to strike it down! I say Christians, because the churches have jurisdiction only over their own members—those without will be judged by the civil and military tribunals of the country.

Political governments are organizations ordained of God for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well, and are to be faithfully and religiously obeyed as such. And no one can have any reasonable apology for raising his arm to strike them down, unless they fail of these great ends. Then, and then only, may they be abated as public nuisances. But in a representative democracy, like that of the United States, with a written constitution, which makes provision for any change or amendment, which experience or advancing civilization may require, the better to adapt it to the great ends of free government; and where the rulers are elected for short terms by the people, and then returned to their constituents, to give an account of their stewardship, I can not conceive of any defect in the constitution that could not be better remedied in a constitutional way; nor of any wrong or oppression by the temporary rulers, that could not be better redressed by an appeal to the people through the ballot-box than by an appeal to arms. An insurrection in such a case is attempted suicide—is an insurrection of the people against themselves—a rebellion of the minority against the majority, in utter disregard of the great

principle, which must from inexorable necessity, control all free governments, namely, that the majority shall rule; and when they shall have declared their will in a legal and constitutional way, that the minority shall submit to their sovereign decree. But in case of a rebellion of the minority against the majority, should they succeed in such a strange and hopeless enterprise, is there any *probability*, or *even possibility* that they could institute a new form of government that would better secure the rights of the people, than the happy form of government under which we live, with a provision in its organic law, for any amendment in a peaceable and constitutional way, which the American people may deem necessary in the great charter of their freedom? Every right-minded man must answer this question with a broad and emphatic NO!

The teaching of the Apostle Peter upon the great subject of submission to political rulers, is equally clear and explicit: "*Submit yourselves,*" says he to his Christian brethren, "*to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king as supreme (ruler), or unto governors as unto them, who are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing you might put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. As free and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness; but as the servants of God. Honor all men. Love the brotherhood; fear*

God; honor the king." (1st Peter, ii, 13-17.) How could submission to kings, and governors, and political rulers, be more clearly and explicitly enjoined. The Apostle Peter and his Christian brethren were then living under the authority of the Roman empire, and these injunctions of Peter apply to political rulers in general, and to those of the Roman empire in particular. And if such was the obligation resting upon Christians, to submit to the authorities of the Roman government, often stained with crime, and with the most cruel and relentless persecution of Christians, with what additional weight does the obligation rest upon Christians to submit to the benign government of the United States, which had never been felt as a burden, and had only been felt in the benefits and blessings it conferred? It had never wronged the States that raised their arms to strike it down, unless, indeed, it was in indulging their whims and in gratifying their unreasonable demands, as a too-fond mother sometimes does those of her spoiled and petted children. The wrong, if any, was not in withholding favors, but was in bestowing too many.

Paul is equally definite in teaching his Christian brethren the duty of submission to their political rulers. To Titus he says, (iii, 1). "*Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates,*" etc. The Jewish Christians had become very restive under the Roman yoke; many of them

thought it incompatible with the dignity of a Jew and a Christian to be subject to the authority of a heathen magistrate. Hence the injunction of Paul to Titus. He would have him to correct this error among the Jewish Christians, and to enjoin upon all the Christian brethren submission to the authority of their political rulers, though that authority might, in the providence of God, be vested in the hands of a heathen magistrate.

The Roman government, with all its sins upon its head, was one of the best of ancient times, and how long and dark the dreadful night that followed, when the sun of that empire set to rise no more!

Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, treats this subject more *in extenso*, and in terms yet more emphatic. He says: "*Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God. Whoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same—for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore you must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also*

for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers—attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another" (that is, discharge all your obligations), "*for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.*" (Rom. xiii, 1–8.

Here the apostle enjoins upon his Christian brethren submission to the powers that be, in the clearest and most emphatic language; and launches against all who resist the power the most dreadful denunciation. *No sophistry can evade the force of the injunction, or turn the edge of the terrible denunciation.* Both the injunction and denunciation come clothed with the *awful sanction of Divine authority*, and sound like an echo from Sinai's awful summit. WHOEVER, THEREFORE (be he Jew or Christian or heathen, WHOEVER HE MAY BE), THAT RESISTETH THE POWER, RESISTETH THE ORDINANCE OF GOD; AND THEY THAT RESIST, SHALL RECEIVE TO THEMSELVES DAMNATION; because they not only resist the political power, but in so doing, they resist also the ordinance of God—defy alike the power of God and man, and therefore shall receive to themselves *damnation*.

The term powers that be, here applies to all political powers generally; but more especially to the powers of the Roman empire, under whose jurisdic-

tion the apostle and his Christian brethren were living. These powers are organizations, clothed with the dread sanction of Divine authority, for the *punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well*; and are to be submitted to as a high and sacred religious duty, due *alike to the political power, and to God himself*; for *He ordained and established the power for the protection and security of human rights*.

If then submission even to the Roman power, often stained with the blood of the martyred heroes of the Church, was a sacred religious duty; and resistance to that power was resistance to the ordinance of God; and damnation was denounced against those who resisted the power, by an inspired apostle who wrote as the Divine Spirit directed his pen; *where shall we find language to express with sufficient emphasis the obligation of Christians, and of all citizens, to submit to the government of the United States*, which stands out the wonder and admiration of the world, as the best and most benign government ever devised by the wisdom of man? *And where shall we find fitting terms to declare the deep damnation due to those who have not only resisted this benign government, but have raised their traitorous arms to strike it down*, and in the mad effort have destroyed the lives of half a million of men—have deluged the country in blood—filled the land with widows and orphans, with the maimed, diseased, and dying—the

asylums with lunatics, the poorhouses with paupers, and burdened all the winds under heaven with the sighs and groans and lamentations of bereaved widows, and orphans, and fathers, and mothers, and brothers, and sisters, who refuse to be comforted because their loved ones are no more? They sleep in unknown graves beneath a southern sky. They went down in the shock and tempest of battle, or died in the dreadful prison-pens of the South—rendering up their lives to save the republic from disruption, and to perpetuate the great heritage of American freedom, which these misguided church-members and their confederates in crime sought to destroy. And, O, how many widows and orphans, in poverty and in tears, wait and watch for husbands and fathers who shall never come again, because they died by the hands of these church-members, and sleep their last sleep in unknown graves!

If a true history of this rebellion, with all its attendant circumstances of atrocity, shall ever be written, it will stand out on the page of history as the blackest of all the crimes in the dark and dreadful catalogue of human guilt. And yet many, who have been engaged in this dreadful work, come back from the slaughter of their countrymen, with garments all dripping with the blood of the heroic defenders of our nationality, and of our heritage of freedom, to resume their places in the churches, as if they had only been absent on excursions of ordinary business

or pleasure. And the churches, either from sympathy with their treason, or for the sake of peace, seem disposed to receive them without repentance, without admonition, and without reproof; forgetting that treason is rebellion against God, and that the wisdom which comes from above is *first pure and then peaceable*; and that they are required to put away from among them every wicked person, and to withdraw from every one called a brother who walks disorderly. We here drop the Bible aspect of the subject, with a view of considering the offense in a civil and political point of light, and then of grouping both views together.

The Constitution of the United States declares that "*treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies—giving them aid and comfort.*" It also clothes Congress with power to declare the punishment of treason. This Congress has done, declaring, besides other penalties, that the offender shall be hanged by the neck until he is dead.

"In England," until a very recent date, "the punishment of treason was most terrible and appalling: 1. That the offender be drawn to the gallows, and not be carried or walk, though (usually by connivance, at length ripened by humanity into law), a sledge or hurdle was allowed to preserve the offender from the extreme torment of being dragged on the ground or pavement; 2. That he be hanged by the

neck and then cut down alive; 3. That his entrails be taken out, and burned while he is yet alive; 4. That his head be cut off; 5. That his body be divided into four parts; 6. That his head and quarters be at the king's disposal." ("Though the king might dispense with all these items of punishment save the hanging.") Such was the dreadful punishment prescribed by the law of England for treason. And why this terrible punishment, so shocking to the sensibilities of modern civilization? It was because in the judgment of England, as well as in the common judgment of mankind, embodied in the solemn form of law, by all nations ancient and modern, treason is the highest crime which man (considered as a member of society) can possibly commit. For it strikes at the very existence of all social order, and imperils the lives, the liberty, and the property of the entire community; and is in itself an aggregation of all crime—involving robbery, arson, murder, and almost every other crime in the calendar of human guilt. Our ancestors, therefore, in some instances, punished with these circumstances of extreme torture a crime that upheaves, as with the throes of an earthquake, the very foundations of society, and opens a bottomless fiery abyss, in which millions may be engulfed. This barbarous punishment has happily passed away with the iron age in which it originated, and the abrogated law prescribing it only remains on the records of the dead past

as a monument of the horror with which our ancestors viewed a crime fraught with such incalculable woes.

The treason of Kentucky rebels is of the deepest and most atrocious die, because not only committed against the United States, the mildest and best government in the world, but committed also against their own State of Kentucky (if indeed treason can be committed against a state). Their crime, therefore, stands forth in all its naked deformity, without any plea, not even the miserable heresy of state rights, to mitigate its dreadful atrocity. The same is true of the rebels of other loyal states. They are justly regarded by the President of the United States as more guilty than those of the disloyal states; and are, therefore, excepted from his amnesty proclamation. And shall these guilty men, with damnation denounced against them by the law of God, and confiscation, disfranchisement, and death denounced against them by the laws of their country, be permitted to come back—take their seats in the congregations of which they had been members, and enjoy again all the privileges of membership, without repentance and without reproof? The churches that suffer these things become partakers of these men's sins and render their damnation sure. For as certain as a righteous God rules over the universe, and as certain as he has denounced damnation against those who resist the powers that be,

just so certain, does this terrible denunciation rest with more than ordinary weight and solemnity upon these guilty men; and also that other denunciation that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." For they are murderers in the common judgment of mankind, embodied in the form of law by every civilized nation under heaven. For by the laws of the civilized world, where a number of persons combine to destroy the life of another, and all are on the ground, aiding and abetting in the act, or stationed sufficiently near to afford aid and assistance if necessary, all are principals in the murder. Those that strike the mortal blows, are principals in the first degree, and the others are principals in the second degree. All are held equally guilty of murder and punishable with death. And in treason there are no accessories, all are principals. These men, therefore, are not only traitors, but murderers, though perhaps some of them might not with their own hands have actually killed any one, yet they were on the ground making the effort to kill, and aiding and abetting those who did actually kill by thousands and hundreds of thousands our patriotic soldiers, who had gathered around the life of our nation to save it from destruction by armed traitors.

Will the churches, then, admonish these men of the dreadful sins they have committed, and endeavor to lead them to true repentance and to a throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and forgiveness—

remembering that he who converts a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins? Great as are the sins these brethren have committed, I do not regard their cases as hopeless; but their repentance must be *deep* and *thorough* if they would obtain forgiveness from a righteous and merciful God. They must heartily forsake and repudiate the sin—do works meet for repentance by making amends, as far as possible, for the wrongs they have done; and must then seek forgiveness from God and also from the churches of which they are members, and then according to the law of the Lord, upon public admonition, they may be restored to church fellowship. For those who sin are to be rebuked before all, that others also may fear (1 Tim. v, 20). And those who oppose any church action in the cases of these misguided brethren are (unwittingly perhaps) the greatest enemies to their spiritual and everlasting interest.

But brethren say, "O, these brethren are just as good as we are!" Brethren may say this of themselves, because they probably know themselves better than I do; but with all my imperfections upon my head, in the name of all that is true and of good report among men, I protest against being included in any such category. This sweeping remark levels all distinction between loyalty and disloyalty; between righteousness and iniquity; between obe-

dience to God and the powers that be, and treason against all government both human and divine. What strange judicial blindness has fallen upon the moral vision of men as they stand amid the moral and physical desolation that has been wrought by the roaring, raging tempest of treason in its wide and dreadful sweep! Like men lost and bewildered, they have utterly lost their moral bearings, and in their moral dementia they call evil good and good evil—put darkness for light and light for darkness, and thus incur the woe of the prophet. Who shall anoint these blind eyes that they may see? or unstop these deaf ears that they may hear? Who shall clothe the dry bones of this desolate valley with flesh, and breathe into the renewed forms the breath of life, that they may live again? Who shall be able for these things? Is there no hope for spiritual Israel?

Another brother says, "These brethren are just as conscientious as we are, and therefore we ought to receive them without any mention of the past." I do not know whether these men are so conscientious or not. I can not penetrate the deep of the human heart, and pronounce upon the consciences of rebels; and I do not exactly see how any one can do it that has not traveled that road as well as the way of loyalty; and even then that would only be the experience of one person, and would by no means prove that such was the experience of all

rebels. I doubt whether any sane mind can be so perverted as to come to such a conclusion as this. Still some persons are given over to strong delusions that they may believe a lie and be damned, because they receive not the love of the truth. The conscience may become strangely perverted and estranged from the way of righteousness. What is properly called conscience is only a moral feeling, and like all the other feelings of the human heart, is blind. It follows the decisions of the understanding upon moral questions as inseparably as a shadow follows a substance in the sunshine; so that if the understanding errs in its decisions, which are mere intellectual processes, conscience errs with it; if the understanding stumbles and falls into the ditch, conscience falls in after it. If the understanding or intellect, then, has been trained to call evil good and good evil, treason loyalty and loyalty treason; to call rebels patriots and patriots rebels (as was done in the South to work up and perpetuate the rebellion), and therefore errs in its decisions, conscience errs with it. So true is this that Jesus told his disciples that "the time would come, when those who put them to death would think they did God service." But did He say to his disciples, they are therefore just as conscientious and as good as you are? No verily, such confounding of good and evil, of righteousness and iniquity had been utterly fatal

to His Divine pretensions. (He taught if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch.)

Paul was one of those misguided men. He declares that he had lived in all good conscience from his forefathers. Even when dabbling his hands in the blood of the saints for doing the very things which the Messiah had commanded them to do, he was acting in all good conscience. But was he therefore innocent and as good as they? Was this his view after his mind had been enlightened by the Word of God? No! looking back afterward on this career of blood, he most feelingly and in deepest self-abasement upbraids himself as the chief of sinners. And in all his after life, with a broken and contrite heart, and with a burning zeal always at a white heat, amid hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness, obloquy and disgrace, stripes and imprisonment—amid perils by land and by sea, among heathen and among false brethren, with a restless energy which knew no languor or abatement, he labored by night and by day to save others from the dreadful gulf of ruin from which he had been rescued by the mercy of God, and to make some amends for the great sins he had committed—presenting in his wonderful labors of love a spectacle of moral grandeur that has no parallel in the world's history. O, then, teach these returning rebels that only in deep contrition and a hearty repudiation of their sins, and earnest prayer to God for mercy, can they expect forgive-

ness from God for the great sins they have committed, and that only on these conditions can they again be received back into the churches. Any other course would be disloyalty to the King of kings. And any other course must utterly destroy the saving power of the churches. How can the churches rebuke any *minor sins*, when *the crowning sin of the age, nay, of the ages*, goes unrebuked? Church-members will spurn and spit upon your authority, if you attempt to lay the hand of discipline upon them for dancing, gambling, lying, defrauding, drunkenness, or any of the common sins of the age, when the *crowning sin of the ages*—comprehending within its terrible sweep the sum of all sin, goes utterly unrebuked. How would a church appear after deciding that this great sin in the person of one of its members should go unrebuked, and yet at the very same meeting should take up a young sister, and exclude her for dancing, or a young brother, and exclude him for cheating his neighbor in a horse-swop; or an old brother, and exclude him for getting drunk? Would not this look like keeping the church pure? It would look very much like straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel. That church would then be prepared for the coming of the Lord!

We will suppose that the above case occurs in a church, where members are tried in committee of the whole, and that after the church has decided that

the returned rebel has committed no offense deserving reproof, he holds up his hand for the exclusion of the sister or brother in the supposed case. Would not this look like Satan reproving sin? O, shame on such trifling with divine authority! Save, O save, my Christian brethren of every denomination, the Church of Christ from such defilement and ruin; and save, if possible, these misguided brethren from the terrible judgments of God that await them, unless they repent, do works meet for repentance, and sue for mercy at a throne of grace, and when you think that God has received the returning penitent then you may receive him and restore him to the privileges of the church; otherwise it is your duty to withdraw from him and from all others called brethren who walk disorderly.

But, again, brethren would have no church action in the cases of these brethren, because they were honest in what they did, and thought they were doing right. Why, some of those concerned in the dreadful tragedies in Washington, if any credit is to be given to their statements, thought that they were doing right! And this was the plea urged in defense of Payne. His counsel asked him why he attempted to assassinate Mr. Seward, and he replied because he thought it was right. His counsel endeavored to show that he was a regularly educated assassin, and having graduated in this profession, when he found a case suited to his taste, he ad-

dressed himself to the accomplishment of the work; and his counsel, with the audacity of a spirit fresh from pandemonium, urged his acquittal on that ground, because it was simply in the line of the profession to which the man had been educated, and of which he was a regular graduate! And it is very possible, that these good, conscientious brethren, who have returned from the innocent work of slaughtering their fellow-citizens, because they stood in the way of the destruction of the life of the nation, are pretty much of the same way of thinking!

Shall the murderer, when the hand of justice is laid upon him, turn and raise his blood-red hands and reeking dagger toward heaven, and declare he is innocent, because he is conscientious in what he has done, and thought he was doing right, and therefore justice has no claim upon him? Shall the hand of justice be palsied by such a plea? and shall he release the criminal from his grasp? This is the strange doctrine that is now brought to our ears. Then close the sanctuaries of religion and the halls of justice, for the religion of our fathers and the genius of justice that presided over the tribunals of our country have taken their flight from earth, the landmarks of virtue are effaced from the records of time, and all distinctions between virtue and vice, righteousness and iniquity are swept away by the rushing, raging flood of evil that bears away on its resistless tide the hopes and fortunes of men! Has

pandemonium been established on earth? and has virtue fled from the abodes of men? Stay, O stay, my brethren, this dreadful springtide of evil, that threatens ruin alike to both church and state, and let the law of the Lord be enforced though it sift the church as wheat.

But, says another good brother, "We don't notice the cases of these brethren, because we don't suffer politics to be brought into the church." Pray, my good brother, what do you mean by politics? Many use this term very flippantly, who know not what they mean nor whereof they affirm. The term politics, according to Mr. Webster, in its largest and most comprehensive sense, comprehends the science of government both human and Divine. And surely this good brother would not have all this excluded from the church. But what is frequently meant by politics is the partisan squabbles about the policy of the state or nation in regard to political economy, or the contests between the outs and the ins for the loaves and fishes of office. Surely these matters ought to be kept out of the church. But are questions of overt acts of treason, that have baptized the country in blood and filled the whole heavens with wailings and lamentations for husbands and fathers, sons and brothers, slaughtered by hundreds of thousands, to be summarily dismissed from the consideration of the churches by the simple announcement, "O, we don't suffer politics to come into our

church!" May the Lord save the church from the sin of misnaming treason politics, and allowing the criminal, like other criminals, to escape under an *alias*, when the penalties of confiscation, disfranchisement, and death are denounced against the offender by the laws of the country, and damnation by the law of God.

But it is further objected, that the President of the United States has pardoned most of the rebels, and surely the church ought to be as merciful as the state, and not pursue these men with vengeance, when the chief executive of the nation has pardoned them.

But neither the one nor the other of these is the question before us. The great matter that I would urge upon the common brotherhood, is to save, if possible, these misguided brethren from the error of their way that God may forgive them. This would save many souls from death and cover multitudes of sins, and would save the church from the sin and guilt and shame of winking at the sins of these brethren, and perhaps of making their damnation sure. But the President's proclamation extends not to Kentucky rebels and those of other loyal states. They are expressly excepted from its merciful provisions, as above stated, and doubtless for the reasons there adverted to.

All the arguments that have been urged, to show the weighty and imperative obligations resting upon

Christians to submit to the benign government of the United States and to obey its injunctions, and the dreadful denunciations cited both from the law of God and the laws of our country against those who resist its authority, apply with all their force to all citizens (and to all sojourners in our country, who owe to our government temporary allegiance), whether they be Christians, skeptics, infidels, or heathens.

But I am asked, what should be done with those church-members who have remained at home, but who have persuaded and seduced others to take up arms against their state and country; or who have otherwise aided and abetted the rebellion, and perhaps guerrilla warfare against unarmed citizens; and who perhaps have the guilt of perjury upon their souls in the oath they have taken, that they have never aided and abetted the rebellion?

I answer *unequivocally, if any of these facts can be proved against them*, they should be, forthwith, separated from the churches of which they are members, and never again received until they shall have repented and heartily repudiated their sin, and done works meet for repentance; both because the seducer is more guilty than the victim of seduction, and because he who secretly plots and works mischief in the dark is more dangerous than the open and avowed enemy, as the viper that strikes from his cover in the dark is more dangerous than the

more noble serpent that gives warning by the sound of his rattle before he strikes. And if any church refuse to take action in regard to any of these misguided men, all other churches should withdraw from such church all fellowship and co-operation.

But what should be done with those brethren who “despise dominion and speak evil of dignities;” habitually speaking evil of the rulers of our country, weakening the authority of government, and encouraging the spirit of lawlessness and rebellion that abounds throughout the land?

They should be promptly admonished, and if they persist in their course, they should be separated from their respective congregations. Though they may not have actually committed overt acts of treason, yet they have committed treason in their hearts—are exposed to the divine displeasure, and if they persist in their course they must perish in the gainsaying of Cora. They are making the returned rebel soldiers more disloyal than ever, and are sowing the seeds of disloyalty to all government both human and divine.

Again; I am asked what should be done with those, called ministers of Christ, who have been aiding and abetting the rebellion, whether by word or deed, giving to it the weight of their influence?

My answer is: they should be excluded alike from the pulpit and the church. He who ministers in sacred things, should come into the sanctuary of

the Lord with clean hands, a pure heart, and with hallowed lips; and not with treason upon his lips, rebellion in his heart, and with hands stained with innocent blood. The breath of such a one is poison, his contact is death. It is Satan in the robes of an angel of light, rebuking minor sins the more effectually to overthrow all authority both human and divine, and to lead men captive at his will.

But it is objected that "our Revolutionary fathers were rebels, that they resisted the power of Great Britain, and if the divine law enjoining submission to the powers that be, and denouncing damnation against those that resist the power, applies to the rebels who have waged war against the United States, it applies also to our Revolutionary fathers."

But the cases are very dissimilar. There were minor questions at issue between the colonies and Great Britain; the chief questions, however, at issue were taxation and representation, and the right of trial by a jury of the vicinage. Parliament had taxed the colonies without their having any voice or representation in that body, and the British authorities had transported citizens of the colonies to England for trial for alleged offenses in America. Against these wrongs the colonies respectfully remonstrated—contending that these acts of the mother country were in violation of the British Constitution; that taxation and representation were inseparable, and that it was the birthright

of every subject of Great Britain to be tried by a jury of the neighborhood in which the offense with which he stood charged was alleged to have been committed; expressing their love and devotion to the mother country, and their wish to remain colonial dependents of Great Britain.

The remonstrances of the colonies against these and other wrongs, and their protestations of love and devotion to the mother country were utterly disregarded by the British authorities. And after a long series of wrongs committed by the mother country against the colonies, the only tendency of which seemed to be to enslave a free people, she actually commenced hostilities against them; and long after the war had been commenced, like dutiful and affectionate children, they still clung to the mother country, hoping that reason would return and that the mother they loved so well would yet do them justice. And it was not until the mother country had waged war against them for fourteen months and fifteen days, when all hope of reconciliation was gone, that the united colonies declared their independence, and took their equal and independent stand among the nations of the earth.

But how stands the case with Southern rebels? Without being able to allege a single wrong done them by the government of the United States, seven cotton states passed their ordinances of secession, declaring their separation from the Union.

They, moreover, declared that they *wanted no compromise; that give them a carte blanche and let them write their own terms and they would not accept them; that they wanted no farther union with the North.* And some of them said that they had been plotting the scheme of secession for thirty, and others said for forty, years. And while the government at Washington was waiting for a return of reason to the South, Fort Sumter was assailed and taken, Washington was threatened, and it was proclaimed that terms of peace would be dictated in Faneuil Hall in Boston!

Where, then, is the analogy between the case of our Revolutionary fathers and Southern rebels? It is no where. And those who make the comparison dishonor our fathers. The rebels and their sympathizers will find a more *fitting* example in the revolt of Satan and his rebel hosts against the Divine government!

But whether our Revolutionary fathers were *innocent or guilty of a violation of the law of God enjoining submission to the powers that be, and denouncing damnation against those that resist the power,* does any one suppose that the American Revolution abrogated that law, and that the governments of this world, ordained by God for the protection and security of human rights, have never been under the Divine protection since the Revolutionary War? If so, that was a most unfortunate revolu-

tion, and our fathers did very wrong to repeal that law, and leave the suffering nations without any Divine protection! *But if that law is not a dead letter, but is in full force and vigor, as when first promulgated, as I most certainly believe, then it applies, in all its dreadful import, to the rebels who have waged war against the United States—the most wicked and causeless rebellion known to the annals of time. If it applies not to these guilty men, to whom can it have any possible application? Let those who make the objection answer this question.*

But one of our scribes objects, “that the apostles resisted the powers that be, in that they continued to speak and teach in the name of Jesus after they had been commanded not to do so by a Jewish council!”

But that in this there was no resistance, any one, who has any knowledge of the meaning of the term, ought to know. It was a simple disregard of an unauthorized command of a Jewish council—a command not only in contravention of the high design of the Mosaic institution, but in direct violation of the will of the divine Author of that institution and of governments among men, and also in direct violation of the terms of the Great Commission which the Messiah had given to those holy men. And when the Lord of all speaks, hushed be the voice of the councils and rulers of this world, and let all the earth hear!

The apostles went straight forward in discharge of the high trust committed to their hands, and unresistingly suffered such wrongs as wicked rulers might inflict upon them. And to make their supreme devotion to God and to the great work of saving a sin-ruined world, amid stripes and imprisonment, obloquy and disgrace, when they lifted not a finger against those who wronged them, an apology for treason, is an insult to the Majesty of heaven and to these godly men.

But, again, it is objected that "these brethren have given sufficient evidence of repentance, in that they have returned and resumed their places in their respective congregations."

This objection confesses the guilt of these brethren, and seeks, by a false plea, to shield them from church-discipline. Had they been guilty of drunkenness, or lying, or stealing, would their taking their seats in their respective congregations, and exercising the privileges of members, be regarded as evidence of repentance, and as satisfying the demands of the violated majesty of the divine law? It might be regarded as *heaven-daring presumption*, but no one could regard it as evidence of repentance and of divine acceptance. If so, Satan himself ought long since to have been received into the church, for, when the sons of God came to appear before the Lord, Satan came also! Unfortunately, if this plea is accepted by the church and by these

guilty men, in closing the door against church-discipline, it closes the door also against repentance, and consequently against divine forgiveness, and consigns these unfortunate men to the dreadful doom denounced against them by the law of God.

But I am told that "*these men do not feel that they have done any wrong.*" Then they are given over that they may believe a lie that they may be damned, because they believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness. Like David, they have greatly sinned, but like him, they feel not their guilt. O, for a Nathan to show them their sins that they may repent and that God may forgive them!

But it is urged in bar of any church action in the cases of these brethren, that "large numbers of young men, in many neighborhoods, were pressing into the rebel armies, or otherwise aiding and abetting the rebellion, and that church members were carried away by the popular excitement, as by a flood, and swept into the rebellion!"

Do numbers justify iniquity or sanctify treason against the government either of God or man? Can numbers change the moral character of actions, and make evil good or good evil? If so, the whole antediluvian world, instead of becoming guilty before God, ought from their numbers to have become innocent, and therefore should have been spared instead of being swept from the face of existence (except Noah and his family, faithful among the

faithless), by the mighty waters of the deluge. If the highest crime known to the laws of God and man, when committed by church members, is to be suffered to pass even without rebuke by the church on account of the numbers engaged in the sin, why not receive all the world into the church on account of their numbers, though stained with every imaginable sin, because the vast majority are rebels against God? Surely, if the most flagrant sin is to be tolerated on account of the numbers engaged in it, minor sins, *a fortiori*, ought to be tolerated upon the same principle; and thus would the Church of Christ soon become a synagogue of Satan! I know a church in Kentucky where a young lady was separated from the church for dancing a little at a social party, but where red-handed rebel church-members, fresh from fields of slaughter, are received back into the church without the least admonition. If numbers are held by churches as sanctifying sin, what a melancholy exhibition does it present of the frailty of those who would be governed by the Bible! The precept of the great Hebrew lawgiver, "*Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil*," is forgotten. Do not the churches that receive these guilty men without reproof become partakers of their sins, and involve themselves with them in one common ruin?

Why were vast multitudes of the Jewish nation cut off, and others plucked up and sold into slavery

among the nations for putting to death the Great Messiah? But few of the Jews were actually concerned in that judicial murder, and very few actually concerned in it were living at the time that awful punishment overtook that guilty nation. Why, then, did the nation suffer for the act of a few? *It was because the nation approved the act of the few, and thereby assumed and incurred their guilt.* Let the churches, therefore, beware how they receive into their bosom these guilty men, lest they thereby assume their guilt, and subject themselves to the same dreadful punishment denounced by the law of God against these rebels.

But I am told that the terrible denunciation in Rom. xiii, 2, though apparently clothed with all the terrors of the power of Almighty God, is only declaratory of the punishment, which the political power may inflict if its authority be resisted!

And is that all? Have we here the anomaly of a Divine law without any Divine sanction or penalty—a Divine law with a merely human penalty! And has Divine justice no demands upon the offenders, because the Divine law, in these cases, has only a human sanction; and must these cases for the want of a Divine penalty, all be referred for final adjudication to the uncertain justice of mere human tribunals! What a wide door this opens into heaven for the bloodiest wretches that ever afflicted our race! Traitors then, may uproot the very founda-

tions of society, may resist the ordinance of God, may oppose and slay His ministers, who are waiting upon the public interests, may deluge the whole land in blood, and cover the face of society with a dark pall of nameless sorrow, and yet go for ever unwhipped of Divine justice; because forsooth, the Divine law prohibiting these dreadful sins, by some strange oversight, has no Divine but only a human sanction!—and if they have been guilty of the violation of no other Divine law, they have an open door to heaven; and if human justice should overtake them, and send them out of the world by a halter, it would only hasten their entrance into the realms of endless bliss, though their hands and garments are dripping with innocent blood! Does any but a madman believe this? Does any one suppose that these bloody handed traitors, who have brought upon the American people more than an Iliad of woes, can without thorough repentance and reformation of life, escape the damnation of hell. I say this in mercy,—desiring their repentance that they may be saved. Knowing the terrors of the Lord I warn them of their danger, and I would be unfaithful to my high trust as a Christian minister, if I did not do it.

But I am asked: “*Are you a coercionist? Do you believe in coercion?*”

Who asks these questions? The highwayman; who has robbed a traveler of his watch, and sets

upon him to coerce him into a surrender of his pocket book! The traveler impelled by the instincts of self-preservation, defends himself against the murderous assault of the highwayman, and when the highwayman begins to sink beneath his sturdy and well directed blows, he cries out: "*Are you a coercionist? Do you believe in coercion?*" *Now who is the coercionist here? It is the highwayman,* who had robbed the traveler of his watch—attempted to coerce him into a surrender of his pocket book; and was only prevented from succeeding in his effort at coercion, by the superior prowess of the traveler. And he ought to be very thankful that he got off with his life, and escaped the penitentiary.

But it is not the highwayman, who asks these questions; but criminals infinitely more guilty than he. It is traitors of the most crimson die. He attempted the life of a single traveler, they attempted the life of the great Republic of America. As the life then of this great nation, is to the life of one man, so is the guilt of these rebels to the guilt of the highwayman. They had passed secession ordinances, had seized upon the mint of the United States at New Orleans, and upon all the forts, arsenals, custom houses, arms, dock yards, etc., of the United States, within their power, and held them in hostility to the United States. They had raised large armies, and had actually commenced war against the United States to coerce them into a

surrender of all the slave states, and as much of the territory of the United States as possible, that they might organize them into a separate and independent confederacy; when the government and loyal people of the United States, impelled by the common instincts of self-preservation, accept the gage of battle thus forced upon them and defend their sacred rights and the life of the nation against the bloody assaults of these armed traitors, with a vigor and a prowess that cause the armed hosts of the rebellion to stagger and reel beneath their heavy and well directed blows, and that send their thinned and broken columns flying in dismay before the victorious American eagle; when defeat and disaster thicken upon them and fill them with terror and dismay, they lift up their bloody hands, and, as if with holy horror, exclaim: "*Are you coercionists? Do you believe in coercion?*"

Now who are the coercionists in this case? Every right minded man must answer, the rebels are the coercionists. They sought to coerce the government and loyal people of the United States into an acquiescence in the dismemberment of the Republic. The loyal portion of the community fought purely in self-defense; and as soon as the rebels desisted from their efforts to dismember the Republic, the war ceased. If the rebels failed in their efforts at coercion, it was only because they were over-matched by the loyal portion of the American peo-

ple, and beaten in the conflict which they themselves had commenced—for the mad purposes of coercion and dismemberment. But, says one: “*You whipped us, and compelled us to submit to your Yankee rule; and I call that coercion.*” Yes, when you forced us into the conflict, we intended to give you a sound thrashing—compel you to submit to the government of the United States, and, if possible, to make decent citizens of you.

But these rebels tell us all that they asked was to be let alone. A very modest request truly! why all that any pirate, rogue or highwayman asks, is to be let alone in his robbery, bloodshed and devastation. And all these rebels modestly ask, is to be let alone in their diabolical work of plundering and dismembering the great American Republic! I greatly marvel at this surpassing modesty! And they think it very hard that they were compelled to desist from this mad enterprise—well, I suppose:

*No rogue ever felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law.*

But these rebels ought to feel very thankful that their lives have been spared, and that they are graciously permitted to live in a country, whose soil they have wantonly reddened with the blood of half a million of slaughtered countrymen. In penitence and deep humility may they seek forgiveness of God, of the churches of which any of them may be members, and of the American people against all of

whom they have so greatly offended; and may they thus find forgiveness and acceptance; and may we all strive together for the glory of God, the good and happiness of each other, and the honor of the American name, that the sun of freedom may enlighten all the nations of the earth, and that all kindreds, tribes and peoples may rejoice in its beams and in the beams of that better sun—the sun of righteousness.

But, again, it is objected that “the institution of slavery was menaced by the incoming administration of Mr. Lincoln; that the South went to war to save the institution from being overthrown, and the fact that it has been overthrown shows that their apprehensions were well founded.

This is a palpable non-sequitur. The Republican party expressly disavowed in their platform any purpose or authority to interfere with slavery where it existed, and simply declared it to be their purpose to oppose its farther extension; and notwithstanding the Republican Congress of 1860 and 1861 had been elected to oppose the further extension of slavery, yet they passed laws for the organization of several new territories, and in each of those laws they not only did not prohibit slavery from going into the territory, but as a peace-offering to the South, expressly prohibited the territorial legislature from interfering with the domestic institutions of the territory, having direct reference to the security of

slave property in the territories. And Mr. Lincoln, "one of the most upright of Chief-Magistrates," was very reluctant to interfere with slavery, and it was only when the life of the nation seemed to hang trembling in the balance, and the alternative arose whether the nation or slavery should perish, that Mr. Lincoln, with a somewhat hesitating and reluctant hand, struck the blow that sent the colossal evil, that had so long disturbed the public peace, reeling down to the dust. And as a war-measure the right to do so was unquestionable. The war-power of the United States involves the right and the duty of national preservation, and overrides every barrier that stands in the way of saving the nation from disruption or destruction. Pending the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, it was objected that the war-power under the Constitution was unlimited, and, therefore, dangerous to the liberties of the people. To this the immortal Alexander Hamilton replied: "The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite; and for this reason no constitutional shackles can wisely be imposed on the power to which the care of it is committed. This power ought to be co-extensive with all possible combinations of such circumstances; and ought to be under the direction of the same councils which are appointed to preside over the common defense.

"This is one of those truths which to a correct and unprejudiced mind carries its own evidence

along with it, and may be obscured, but can not be made plainer by argument or reasoning. It rests upon axioms as simple as they are universal—the means ought to be proportioned to the *end*; persons from whose agency the attainment of any *end* is expected, ought to possess the means by which it is to be attained.”

And James Madison, called the father of the Constitution, upon the same subject says: “With what color of propriety could the force necessary for defense be limited by those who can not limit the force of offense. . . . The means of security can only be regulated by the means and danger of attack. They will, in fact, be ever determined by these rules, and by no others. It is in vain to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation. It is worse than in vain, because it plants in the Constitution itself necessary usurpations of power.”

Here, then, is a power granted by the American people themselves in their national Constitution—a power limited only by the national resources and the laws of civilized warfare. It follows, therefore, as a necessary corollary to the above axiomatic truths, that the government that is clothed with this tremendous power for the protection and defense of the nation against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, may slay such enemies in battle—may wrest from them their arms, their munitions of war, their

means of subsistence, or any other means which strengthen their hands or enable them to do mischief. The government may also, as an element of power, manumit the slaves of the nation, and may arm them to fight against the common enemy; and, as a means of weakening the enemy and of increasing their own strength, they may emancipate his slaves and arm them to fight against him.

All these principles had been settled long before our late civil war, and are, indeed, coeval with wars among men. They were settled by the Revolutionary war. Great Britain in that war issued a proclamation of emancipation, and the result was the emancipation of some thirty thousand slaves (I believe) belonging to the colonies. And our government emancipated quite a number of slaves, who had fought for us in that great struggle, together with their families. The same great questions were again settled by the Congress of the United States at the close of the late war with Great Britain, and also in the Florida war. Negroes, as war-measures, were emancipated in both these wars. Claims for them were brought by their masters in both instances before Congress, and in both instances Congress decided that the emancipation of the slaves were legitimate war-measures, and that the owners were, therefore, not entitled to any compensation though their loyalty was unquestionable.

France, as a war-measure, emancipated the slaves

of San Domingo, and it was the attempt to re-enslave them, that led to the bloody massacre there.

The right therefore of the government of the United States to emancipate the slaves of the states in rebellion, as a just and legitimate war measure, rests upon truths as obvious and well settled, as the right to repel and overthrow a public enemy. But there is another reason why the government had a right to strike down slavery. Slavery had been arrayed against the government as a public enemy, and menaced the very existence of the nation; the nation therefore had a right to strike it down as a measure of public safety. But, again, the rebels made slavery the prize for which they fought, and having lost in the game of war, they are bound as honorable sportsmen to give it up. They appealed to the arbitrament of the sword, and the decision is against them. Well they have given it up. They have abolished slavery in all their new constitutions. They have been converted into abolitionists! The *hard arguments* of northern abolitionists have converted them to their new gospel!—and it is marvelous in our eyes! It looks very much like the dawn of the millennium; for nations, (or rather states) are born in a day! I hope that these latter day saints will fellowship their northern abolition brethren, and that we shall not have an abolition church north, and an abolitionist church south, but that all may belong to one common communion!

But it is farther objected: "If church members who have been engaged in the rebellion be dealt with by the churches, church members who have defended the life of the nation against these and other rebels, who attempted its destruction, must also be dealt with.

This objection is raised not as a weapon of offense, to smite alike both rebel and Union soldiers, but as a shield, to protect rebels from church discipline. It may shelter them from the discipline of the church, but can not shelter them from the judgments which God has denounced against them. And if they follow these blind guides both must fall into the ditch. "Let God be true, but every man a liar." Though God has enjoined submission to the powers that be, and has denounced damnation against those who resist the power, because in so doing they resist also the ordinance of God, yet this objection levels all distinction between those who obey God and the powers that be, and those who resist all lawful authority, both Divine and human. Though God denounces damnation against those who resist the power, yet these objectors, like their prototype, tell them they shall not surely be damned. Will they listen to these false teachers, or will they give heed to the voice of God, and turn from the evil of their way—forsake and repudiate their sin—and live?

Is the man, who defends himself against the assassin, who attempts his life, as guilty as the assassin? Is

the man who defends his mother against his brother, who attempts her life, as guilty as the matricide? The patriot who defends the life of his nation against armed traitors, who attempt its destruction, as guilty as the traitors? Was Peter, who smote off the ear of the servant of the high priest in defense of his Divine Master, as guilty as Judas who delivered him up? This is the doctrine taught by the defenders and apologists of traitors. They teach the way of death, and I fear me walk it too, from their approval of treason with all its bloody deeds, and the bitter and unchristian spirit which they manifest toward all Union persons.

I have no space to argue the question, whether Christians may fight for their country or not; but remark, in passing, that Jesus says to Pilate: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews."

This language clearly recognizes the right and the duty of the subjects and citizens of the kingdoms and governments of this world to fight for their king and government. No exception is made in favor of Christians; it therefore follows that it is their right and duty to fight when their country demands their services; and especially when their heritage of freedom and the very existence of the government of their choice, are menaced by legions of armed traitors.

But again, the governments of this world are organisms ordained of God for the protection and security of human rights; and are armed with the sword for the maintenance of their existence, the enforcement of their authority, and the protection and security of their rights.

The violence and injustice which have rendered necessary the governments of this world, have made the sword an instrument essential to their existence, and to the accomplishment of the great ends for which God ordained them. And in an aggressive world like ours, if any nation could be guilty of the folly of dispensing with the sword, it would utterly fail of the great ends for which God ordained governments among men. It would soon fail to execute even civil process, the land would be filled with violence, and the government without an arm to enforce its authority, or protect its existence, would be justly doomed to speedy and utter annihilation. As the sword then is essential to national existence, and to the great ends for which governments are instituted among men; and to be resorted to whenever necessary, even in the execution of civil process; often in the execution of criminal process; and when the rights of a nation are trespassed upon by another power, negotiations fail, and her territory is, perhaps, invaded by hostile armies, a resort to arms becomes essential to national existence. The citizens must then fight or the nation perish.

In the late bloody civil war through which we have passed, the loyal citizens had to fight and overcome the armed hosts of the rebellion, or suffer the nation to perish.

Now whatever is essential for the citizens of the governments of this world to do, in order to maintain their existence, or to accomplish the ends for which God ordained them, is right; and whatever is right may be done by Christians; it therefore follows that it is the right and the duty of Christians, to fight whenever the government calls upon them to do so, to enforce its authority or to protect, defend and maintain its just rights.

But again; may not the servants of God aid his public ministers who preside over national affairs in executing the high trust which God has committed to their hands? and may they not fight to preserve the government which God has ordained for the security of human rights. John was to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. This preparation made them morally fit for the kingdom of the Messiah. Now, "The soldiers came to John and demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages." They were not to be guilty of any acts of personal violence toward each other or toward any of the people, nor to accuse any falsely, as was too often done by soldiers for purposes of gain; and were to

be content with their wages. And if they were to be content with their wages, they were required *necessarily* to discharge the duties of soldiers for which they received their wages. The important part of which duty was to fight when their country demanded it. Then, according to John, those who had all the moral fitness necessary to Christians might fight as soldiers.

And Cornelius, one of the best men of his age, was a military Roman officer, commanding a hundred men. And when Peter baptized him, there is no intimation that he told him he must resign his commission, that he could no longer be a soldier. Wherefore we conclude that a Christian may be a soldier, and as such may fight for his country.

But I am told that slavery is a Divine institution, that profane abolitionists meditated its overthrow, and that the pious Southerners fought to save this Divine institution from destruction by Northern infidels!

Did these pious devotees of slavery love it so well because they thought they saw the impress of Divinity upon it, and did they fight from a zeal for God, lest one of His institutions should be overthrown by the profane hands of abolitionists? They doubtless believed in the law and the profits, but especially in the profits! But that American slavery is Divine is not altogether clear to my mind! I have read of wild Africans being torn away from their

native forests and sold into slavery in the American colonies, and afterward in the United States of America; but that the authors of these proceedings claimed any Divine warrant for what they did, or wrought miracles, as did Moses, to prove that their mission was divine, I never learned! But I am told that the divine charter for the proceeding is to be found in the ninth chapter of Genesis, and is in the words following, viz: "And he (Noah) said cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."

It strikes me that this is rather a vague charter for the great system of American slavery. It is a somewhat obscure warrant to authorize the arrest of the wild African negro, his transportation to a distant continent, and his sale there into perpetual slavery in the remote ages of the world! I hardly think the proceeding divine or justified by the Oracle! There are several objections to making the Oracle available in this case. 1. It is not certain that the curse had the divine sanction. 2. If it had, was it limited to Canaan, or was it intended to fall upon Canaan and descend upon his posterity in all time to come? 3. If the last, does it mean that Canaan and all his descendants should be slaves individually and actually, or that they should be inferior to their brethren, and less honored than they, as in the case of Esau? Or, 4. That they should be inferior and subordinate to their brethren in a

national point of view? If it meant that they were to be slaves individually and actually, the curse failed in the first ages after it was pronounced, and the right of their cousins to enslave them was lost by *non user*. For the Canaanites settled in Palestine, gave name to the country, and were there as an independent tribe or nation when the Israelites under Joshua entered. Many of them were cut off by the Israelites, some enslaved by them, and the others probably became incorporated with the surrounding tribes and lost their existence as a separate tribe or nation. But that any of them were black or ever settled in Africa, history deposes not. All traces of them are lost at quite an early period of Jewish history. What a vast gap of time exists between the last historical vestiges of the Canaanites and the wild savage negro of modern Africa! A hundred generations have gone down in the mighty chasm! Who shall bridge this vast gulf in which so many nations and generations have disappeared, and call up from the dread abyss the shades of departed witnesses along the line of the ages to testify that the negro on a South Carolina plantation is the veritable descendant of Canaan? Every link in the chain of title and descent must be filled up, and the negro identified as the true lineal descendant of Canaan, or the title, *jure divino*, must fail. The claimant declares on this oracle, and the negro (waiving all objections arising from the ex-

treme improbability that a just God would doom a whole race to bondage through all time on account of a sin committed by the father of their first progenitor, and all other objections arising from presumptions in favor of freedom), pleads that he is not a descendant of Canaan, and throws the *onus probandi* upon the plaintiff.

The genius of justice is called to the judicial bench to decide this litigated case. He calls upon the plaintiff to proceed with his proof. His counsel reads the oracle from Genesis; and then reads from some old historical work, that some of the descendants of Ham settled in Africa. The judge informs him that there are no presumptions in favor of slavery, and that it is not necessary to put a construction on Gen. ix, 25, until he proves that the negro, whom he claims as his slave, *jure divino*, is the true lineal descendant of Canaan; that if he could prove *even* that some of the descendants of *Canaan* settled in Africa, it could create no presumption against the negro, that the proof must be clear and conclusive; if one link in the chain of title and of lineage was wanting, the title could not be sustained! Under this ruling of the court, the counsel for the plaintiff, seeing that he could not establish any divine right to the negro, asked leave of the court to amend his pleadings.

He then declared on the maxim that might gives right!—confessing that American slavery was made

by the American people themselves, and that it originated in cupidity. He also pleaded the usage of ages in its behalf.

To this declaration the negro pleads his right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and that wrong might be aggravated by persistence, but never could be made right by usage,—appealing to God and his country.

The American people have brought in their verdict, which is in the words following, viz: “ *We the jury find for the defendant.*” It is therefore ordered and adjudged that the negro henceforth and for ever go free. This long litigated case is therefore forever set at rest by the supreme tribunal of the American people.

But an apology for treason in a form somewhat new, comes from a son of South Carolina. He says: “And what great crime have the secessionists themselves been guilty of? They believed in that sacred principle set forth in our Declaration of Independence, that every people have the right of self-government, and the right to change and alter their form of government as they may see proper. This was the head and front of their offending—nothing more. They expressed their purpose of living separate from the northern States—that was all. They did not seek to invade the north or govern the north. It was not their purpose to wage war against the northern States; but to live quietly

and peaceably by them as neighbors and friends. They had been taught by their greatest statesmen for half a century past, that they had the right to peaceably secede from the Federal Government; and they attempted to exercise this right. That is all. For this attempt they have been conquered and subdued, their property taken from them, and their country desolated."

This is about as cool audacity and mendacity as mortals usually exhibit. Is this the language of Bedlam or Pandemonium? Comes it from one bereft of reason or of conscience? "They believed in that sacred principle set forth in our Declaration of Independence, that every people have the right of self-government, and the right to change and alter their form of government as they may see proper." Does this apologist for treason deceive himself, or would he deceive others by his fallacies? In what sense does he use the term "every people?" Does he mean by this slipshod use of the term, that the people of a neighborhood have the right to secede from the county of which they form a component part, and erect for themselves an independent government? or that the people of a county have the right to secede from the state to which they belong, and organize for themselves a separate and independent government? or that the people of a state, or of several states of these United States, have the right, *ad libitum*, peaceably to secede from

the union of these states, and to organize themselves into a separate and independent nation or confederacy? Or that any faction or fraction of a nation may do this? If any of all these is his meaning, then no man that is not a fit subject for a lunatic asylum can believe it. The doctrine is subversive of all governments among men—makes all written constitutions and laws mere waste paper—reduces their most solemn provisions and enactments to mere counsel or advice, without any power to enforce submission to their injunctions, because those under one jurisdiction *to-day*, may, *to-morrow*, by the exercise of this “right of every people to self-government,” be under a foreign and wholly different jurisdiction. What does it avail to secede and form a new government *to-day*, for *to-morrow* it may be dissolved and broken into fragments? This doctrine would reduce all governments to the mere ephemera of an hour—would make them as changeable as the drifting sands of the Arabian desert. Rebels themselves, though they have the audacity still to preach this doctrine, do not believe it; for in time of the rebellion, when there were some threats that North Carolina would secede from the bogus rebel confederacy, the secessionists themselves threatened most fiercely to coerce her into submission, if she made any such attempt.

If the leaders of the rebellion believed that they had a just right peaceably to secede from the

“Federal Government,” and form a separate and independent confederacy, why did they not take a straightforward, honest course to lead the people into the movement? Why did they resort to lies the most astounding that ever saluted mortal ears, and that must have sounded strangely audacious even to the ears of the father of lies himself? And when every species of fraud and falsehood failed of seducing many into the rebellion, why was the halter so freely resorted to to silence the opposition of numbers to the movement by stopping their breath, and for the farther purpose of creating a reign of terror in order to drive and stampede others into the diabolical enterprise? These are the proceedings of incendiary outlaws in order to accomplish some infernal purpose, and not the proceedings of honest men who are only seeking their just rights.

If they believed that “every people had the right,” etc., taking the term in the limited sense of the people of the cotton or Southern states, why did they not submit their secession ordinances to the decision of the people of those states respectively through the ballot-box? And when guilty of the sham and falsehood of a pretended submission of the secession ordinance of Tennessee to the vote of the people of Tennessee, why did they declare, “if any man appeared upon the stump to advocate the Union cause, they would shoot him down.” The friends of the Union knew that these violent

men meant what they said, and though many of them were prepared to die if necessary to save the Union, yet they thought it folly to throw their lives away, and therefore they did not appear upon the stump in advocacy of the cause of the Union, save in East Tennessee, where the Union sentiment was largely in the ascendancy! And why did they publish in their papers in Tennessee pending the election, "*Mark every man that votes for the Union, and have a cotton rope prepared for him?*" Why all this? It was because the leaders feared "*the people,*" in whose name they pretended to act, lest if permitted to vote and to vote freely, notwithstanding all the foul means by which they had sought to mislead them, they would vote down and annul all their secession proceedings.

"They believed every people had the right," etc. "This was the head and front of their offending; nothing more." "They expressed their purpose of living separate from the Northern states;" "that was all." "They did not seek to invade the North," etc., "but to live quietly and peaceably by them as neighbors and friends," etc. And was this all? Had their declarations that "their rights must be baptized in blood or they would be worth nothing," no meaning? Had their declarations that "blood must be drawn to fire the Southern heart or the whole enterprise would fail, no significance? If they wished to live in peace with the people of the

loyal states, why did they raise large armies—assail and take Fort Sumter—while as yet the government at Washington had made no preparation for war! And when Fort Sumter fell, why did their secretary of war boast that by the first of May their flag would be flying over the dome of the capital in Washington City, and that they would dictate terms of peace in Faneuil Hall in Boston? Why had they seized on our forts, and arsenals, and custom-houses, etc., and our mint at New Orleans? Why did they with a large army menace Washington City? And when Kentucky refused to join her fortunes to the rotten, bogus concern, why did they declare that “they must have Kentucky though at the price of blood and conquest—that they could not do without her territory?” Was all this nothing? Did all this simply mean peace? And have these secessionists been conquered and subdued, their property taken, and their country desolated, simply on account of their political faith? No! it was for their diabolical attempt to overthrow the government of the United States and to dismember the republic by force of arms, that they have been conquered and subdued. And never, since time began, have rebels so guilty been treated with so much mercy. And what return do they make for the surpassing mercy that has been shown them both by the loyal people and government of the United States? Why, wherever they have the

power, they ostracize and proscribe all loyal men both in church and state, and fill the pulpits and civil offices either with rebel sympathizers or with unrepentant rebels—men who have many regrets because they failed to overthrow the government and dismember the republic—but none for their treason? This is too sadly true in my own native and loved Kentucky. With these misguided men Christianity is only a name, an empty sound; neither the authority of God or man seems to possess the power to bind their consciences! It looks as if some vast demoniacal possession was dragging them down to perdition! Who shall exorcise this spirit of evil whose name is legion? And yet these men think it very hard and altogether unconstitutional that *they* should suffer any disability on account of disloyalty both to the government of God and of the United States, and for all the woes they have brought upon the country. Woe both to the country and church where such men bear rule!

But to return; every people, when the term is used in its true meaning and comprehension, as comprising a nation ought to have the right of self-government and the right to change and alter their form of government whenever the nation, the sole and legitimate judge in the premises, shall in its aggregate capacity think proper to do so, after due deliberation. But the people of a great nation like the people of the United States, with a written con-

stitution, to which all the people of all the states are parties, are bound by the provisions of the constitution while it remains unchanged. And if the constitution like that of the United States contains provisions for its alteration or amendment, alterations or amendments can only be made by *the people*—in manner and form as prescribed in the constitution. To this manner, and to this manner alone, the people and the whole people are bound and limited by their solemn compact, to which every citizen is a party, and which every one is bound by more than the solemnities of an ordinary oath faithfully and religiously to observe.

But this apologist for traitors appeals to “the Declaration of our Independence.” To that Declaration then let us go. The one people there spoken of were the people of the thirteen united colonies. And it was in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, that their representatives in Congress assembled, declared their independence, and for the reasons and purposes stated in said Declaration.

That Declaration, penned by Thomas Jefferson, called the father of Democracy, declares “that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men.” It was because the

British government had become destructive of these great ends, and with a view of securing them by instituting a new form of government, that the good people of the colonies, after many long years of oppression, declared their independence.

This is a reason and purpose somewhat different from the reason and the purpose, which impelled the South to attempt to separate themselves from the Union. Their avowed purpose was to institute a new form of government, whose chief corner stone should not be freedom, but slavery, with a view of perpetuating the bondage of four millions of human beings and their posterity, in all time to come, lest, peradventure, if they remained in the Union, the government of the United States might in some remote and possible contingency, overthrow slavery, though such purpose was positively disavowed.

Thomas Jefferson the author of the Declaration of Independence, in declaring that all men are created equal, etc., meant what he said and said what he meant;—for though under the circumstances himself a slave-holder, yet in principle he was strongly anti-slavery:—and in the draft of the Declaration which he presented to Congress, one of the grievances of the colonies complained of, was the introduction and perpetuation of slavery in said colonies by the mother country. This item was struck out by the pro-slavery party in Congress. The reference therefore to our Declaration of Inde-

pendence as authority for the slaveholders' rebellion to perpetuate slavery, is most unfortunate. Mr. Jefferson afterward speaking of the wrongs of slavery, remarked: "When I remember that God is just, I tremble for my country." Where is the man with a heart in his bosom that does not rejoice that these children of unrequited toil are free? And as their unpaid toil has contributed so largely to our national wealth, who does not feel like lending them a helping hand to elevate them in the scale of being? And do not their wonderful powers of imitation, which enable them not only to adopt the customs of the white man, but his color also, prove their capability of rising in the world, and attest their claims to freedom!

But the stereotyped objection, that has been iterated and reiterated a thousand times, is still urged: "Oh, the rebels have suffered enough; why should they be stricken any more?" How much more have they suffered than the loyal people? Have any more of them fallen in battle, died of wounds, or died of disease contracted in the army? Not a great many more, I apprehend. In these respects, the sufferings are probably nearly equal. But when we take into consideration the dreadful sufferings of our soldiers in the prison-pens of the South, exposed on open grounds, alike in sunshine and storm—winter, spring, summer and autumn—without tents, without blankets, without overcoats (for

these, if they had any, had been taken from them by the rebels), and generally with very scanty ordinary wearing apparel, without suitable water to drink, and with less than half rations, and these generally of an inferior quality—and when food and clothing were sent them by our government, even these god-sends were, by the keepers of these abodes of death, denied to these prisoners, sinking, daily sinking, by slow torture from starvation and exposure to all weathers, until the tardy messenger of death came at last to release them from their dreadful sufferings! The history of the most savage tribes of men furnishes no instances of equal cruelty to prisoners, not even that of the Thugs of India, the Bushmen of Africa, or that of the savages of the Fejee Islands. They have tortured their prisoners, but no instances of such protracted and cruel torture of prisoners of war was ever known before. Mind and body often sunk together, until the mind was blotted out, and the skeleton form reduced to utter helplessness, when death came at last to the relief of the wretched victim of this more than savage barbarity. And in one instance at least, in the prison-pen at Andersonville, in Georgia, when these skeleton forms were called up right on the verge of the dead-line, to get some thing to eat, the poor fellows hobbled up to partake of the scanty meal, three or four accidentally passed the dead-line, and were all instantly run through with a bayonet, by one of the keepers, and

cruelly murdered. When the terrible sufferings of these persons, whom the fortunes of war placed in the hands of the enemy, and who were thus murdered, by slow torture, from exposure and starvation, to the number of more than sixty thousand, are taken into consideration, the actual sufferings of the rebels bear no proportion to those of the loyal people. And as for the loss of property, apart from the negro, the difference is not worthy of any contention. And as to that loss, it will ultimately be found by the South, as well as the North, to be great gain.

What sense, then, is there in the objection, "Oh, the rebels have suffered enough?" There is not one particle of sense or reason in it. "A fellow feeling" makes those who preach this doctrine "wondrous kind." But have they been reformed by the sufferings they have brought upon themselves and the country at large? What indemnity have we for the past, and what security that they will keep the peace in future? If they are not reformed by their sufferings—not purified of treason by the fiery ordeal through which they have passed, why should the objection be eternally rung in our ears, even by those who wish to be thought loyal, "Oh, they have suffered enough?"

God pardons not sinners, except upon repentance, and it were well if political rulers would profit by Divine wisdom. The proclamation has gone forth

from the Throne of God to the ends of the earth, to sinners of every shade and of every dye, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." They must forsake their sins, and be prepared, as fast as possible, to make amends for the wrongs they have done, before they can obtain pardon from the merciful and all-wise Ruler of the Universe. Any other course would overthrow the Divine government; and any other course toward rebels and other offenders must impair the authority of our State and national government, and endanger the safety of both—especially to restore to rebels the right of suffrage and of holding office, while they are yet reeking with treason, and with their blood-red hands unwashed by a single penitential tear. To pardon such persons, and restore to them the ballot, while their hearts are all festering with the leprosy of treason, bodes evil, and only evil, to our country. It is to enable them to accomplish by the ballot what they have failed to accomplish by the bayonet—namely, the ruin of our country. Would you put a fire-brand into the hand of an incendiary that he may set your house on fire? Would you replace the dagger in the hand of the midnight assassin, who had just attempted your life, and whom, with great difficulty, you had overpowered and disarmed? And will you replace either the ballot or the bayonet in the hands of the assassins who have attempted the life of the nation? Will you again intrust the fortunes of the ship of state,

the noblest craft that ever plowed the ocean of time, to those desperate men who mutinied, attempted to overpower the crew—to scuttle and sink the noble ship in mid ocean, with her crew and precious freight, with the vain hope that they themselves could escape the general wreck and ruin on a miserable raft? He who could give or take such advice is a monster or a maniac.

But, alas! the remark of the great Pettigru, of South Carolina, might with too much truth be applied to other states than that. A gentleman, visiting Charleston, asked him the way to the lunatic asylum; he replied, “Go any way you please, you can’t miss it in South Carolina!” As these desperate men are hasting to obtain pardon, let them make haste to give evidence of thorough repentance and reformation of life; and when they are purified from the leprosy of treason, and make amends for their crimes as far as possible, then, and then only, can they be safely pardoned and restored to the privilege of ballot and of office.

And how can the church forgive them until they shall have forsaken and repudiated their sin and done works meet for repentance! Till then, for the church to pardon them or wink at the great sins they have committed, could only tend to lull them into false security, and to seal their everlasting overthrow. For every Bible reader, not morally demented by treason, knows that damnation is written

down against these men by the hand of inspiration, and that without repentance God can never pardon them. And why should the government pardon them and restore them to their rights? For if any opportunity should ever occur to overthrow the government by the sword or by the ballot, while treason yet rankles in their bosoms, they will strike for its destruction. It will happen to them according to the true proverb—"The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire."

When they come back, like the prodigal son, with repentance in their hearts and the language of deep contrition upon their lips, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants;" when they come thus penitent and self-abased, then, and not till then, will God pardon them; and then, and only then, can they be safely restored to their privileges either in church or state.

The prodigal son and Zaccheus are genuine cases of repentance. "Half my goods," said the penitent Zaccheus, "will I give to the poor, and if I have defrauded any one by unjust accusation, I will restore fourfold." When the rebels shall give half their goods to the families that have been impoverished by the war they have waged against the country, and shall restore fourfold to those they

have injured, then God will pardon them, and both church and state may then forgive them, and restore them to their former privileges; but until they are sorry enough for the past, to make amends for the wrongs they have done, it were better both for church and state, to keep them on probation.

But it is farther objected, "that these brethren and their confederates in arms, are not guilty of treason, though the latter waged war against the United States, and the former both against the United States and their respective states; because they fought in vindication of the state rights of the South, rights that had been left unsettled by the Constitution of the United States."

"These men not guilty of treason!" Then the framers of the Constitution of the United States, and all law writers and legislators of ancient and modern times, have mistaken the nature of treason. The Constitution of the United States defines treason against the United States, to consist in "levying war against them, or adhering to their enemies—giving them aid and comfort"—the very crime that these men have committed, as the tread of mighty armies, and the dreadful shock of battle, that have shaken the continent, and devastated the country too sadly attest.

But "it was the states' rights of the South for which these men fought, rights that had been left unsettled by the Constitution of the United States."

What rights of the Southern states had been assailed, or invaded? Had not the general government most carefully guarded every right of the Southern states. And did not the Republican Congress of 1860 and 1861, both Senate and House of Representatives, pass, almost unanimously, an act intended to be incorporated into the Constitution of the United States—providing that slavery in the states should never be interfered with by the government of the United States, without the consent of all the states, and which nothing but secession, persisted in, prevented from being incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, and becoming a part and parcel of that instrument? And that very Congress passed several acts—organizing new territories, in all of which provisions were made that the territorial legislatures should pass no laws interfering with the domestic institutions of the territories,—looking directly to the protection of slavery, in the territories—another concession, as a peace offering to the South, to quiet the very sensitive slave interest. And Yancey and Mason proclaimed to France and England, that the government of the United States was pro-slavery, and that they could obtain for slavery any guarantee they might demand. And Alexander Stephens told the South that though in the minority, they had always had a majority of the offices of the United States—executive, cabinet, judicial, consular, diplomatic, etc.—

that they had always controlled the government, and could continue to do it; and that there was no just cause for the rebellion—if they seceded and involved the country in war, a proclamation of emancipation would probably come, slavery would be overthrown, and the whole South would be devastated by hostile armies; and that for the ruin they would bring upon their country the names of those engaged in it would be execrated to the latest ages.

“The state rights of the South!” The right, as they claimed, to secede and resume their separate and independent sovereignty? Resume their separate and independent sovereignty! This right, only existed *in nubibus*, in the clouds, for certainly, it never had any existence on earth, nor could it possibly have; for the very good and valid reason, that these states had never enjoyed any separate and independent sovereignty; and therefore, could not *resume* that, which they had never *assumed*. The thirteen colonies were colonial dependents of Great Britain, until they united to secure their independence of the mother country. It was as United States, they declared their independence—as United States they fought together the battles of the Revolution, and gained their independence. And it was only in Union that they could have succeeded in securing their independence. Louisiana was subject to France, until she was acquired by treaty, and became a territory of the United States; and Flor-

ida was subject to Spain, until she, too, was acquired by treaty, and passed under the jurisdiction of the United States; and the others were territories, under the pupillage of the government of the United States, until admitted into the Union as states. Texas is the only state in the Union that ever enjoyed a separate and independent sovereignty; and that was surrendered by her for ever, when she joined the great sisterhood of the United States. But even if these states had enjoyed separate and independent sovereignties, they were merged and lost in the Union upon the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. For the language of the Constitution is: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union; establish justice; insure domestic tranquillity; provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare; and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution, for the United States of America." How could language more clearly declare a national government, in contradistinction to a league, or federation of states? The inherent and incurable vices of all confederacies of states, where the ordinances of the federal government operate upon states as such, instead of upon individuals, had become sufficiently manifest under the old articles of the confederation; and therefore the people, the source and fountain of all political power, formed a

national government, by making and adopting a national Constitution, under which the laws of the United States operate upon individuals, and are enforced by the arm of the civil magistrate, except in case of insurrection or rebellion.

Under the old Articles of Confederation, the laws or ordinances of the United States operated upon states in their organized capacity, instead of on individuals, and it was in reference to that state of things, under the old Confederacy, that Mr. Madison remarked that the federal government had no power to coerce a state (or a sovereign state). Buchanan, in his message of December, 1860, quotes this remark of Mr. Madison in reference to the powers of the old defunct Confederacy, and misapplies it to the powers of the government of the United States under the present Constitution. Mr. Jefferson was at issue with Mr. Madison on this question. He argued that the government of the United States, under that order of things, had the power or authority to coerce a state; that the power or authority existed from the very necessity of the case, otherwise the laws or ordinances of the federal government would be mere counsel or advice. These great statesmen differed on that question; but as to the power or authority of the government of the United States, under the present Constitution, to coerce a state, or the people of a state, that may resist the authority of the government, the power or authority to de

so has never been called in question until very recently, and that by rebels (and their sympathizers) to shield them from the just penalty of the law, and from that infamy to which their guilt justly consigns them.

The government of the United States is, by the present Constitution, clothed with all the great and essential attributes of sovereignty: "The power to borrow money on the credit of the United States; To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; To establish a uniform rule of naturalization; and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States; To establish post offices and post roads; To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations; To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; To raise and support armies; To provide and maintain a navy; To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, to suppress insurrections, and repel invasions;" To make treaties with other

nations: with all the other great and essential powers pertaining to national sovereignty. Now, the granting of these powers to the national government, by the people of the United States, denies them to the states by necessary implication, both because they had passed out of the hands of the people, and had been vested in the national government, and because of the confusion and conflict of jurisdiction to which any other view would necessarily lead. Yet the framers of the Constitution did not stop here; but expressly denied almost every attribute of sovereignty to the states.

The Constitution declares: "No state shall enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or grant any title of nobility. No state shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts laid by any state on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to revision and control of the Congress. No state shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty on tonnage; keep troops or ships of war in time of

peace; enter into any agreement or compact with another state, or with a foreign power; or engage in war unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay." (The whole secession movement of the Southern states was in direct violation of these prohibitions, as well as of the positive powers with which the United States are clothed.)

Thus the states, not only by necessary implication, but by express prohibitions in the Constitution of the United States, are denied all the great attributes of sovereignty; while the United States are not only expressly clothed with all the attributes of sovereignty, but to silence, if possible, all cavil, the Constitution of the United States declares that "this Constitution and the laws of the United States that shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and all the judges in every state shall be bound thereby—any thing in the constitution or law of any state to the contrary notwithstanding"—thus leaving to the states only a *quasi* and limited sovereignty, under the authority of the United States, which is supreme over all. And it is of the very nature of supremacy to control all within the sphere of its operations.

Where, then, is the right of a state to secede from the United States? It is given to the winds. And

where is the paramount allegiance due to the states, contended for by Southern politicians, with all other pestilent state-right heresies? "Gone to the tomb, where all the kindred of the Capulets lie."

Pending the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, in the State of New York, there were those in the convention there who wished to adopt it conditionally. Alexander Hamilton wrote Mr. Madison, called the father of the Constitution, for his opinion upon the subject. Mr. Madison replied: "*The adoption must be in toto and forever;*" that "a conditional adoption would be worse than no adoption at all."

The Union of the United States is, therefore, no "free-love affair," but is a Union *in toto and forever*. How could the framers of the Constitution, and the great fathers of the Republic have more carefully guarded the country against the state-right heresies which have so long disturbed the public peace?

But, notwithstanding these plain constitutional provisions and the wise counsels of our fathers, the dragon-toothed heresies of paramount allegiance being due to the states, and the constitutional rights of the states to secede *ad libitum* from the Union, were by unscrupulous politicians sown broadcast over the South, from which sprung multitudes of armed men, not only ready to do battle for secession, but to strike down the government of our fathers.

Most of the cotton states were precipitated into secession, the mint of the United States at New Orleans, and most of the forts and arsenals in the seceding states were seized. The whole mad scheme had been worked up by strangely false and exaggerated appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people; and secession precipitated in order to commit them to the diabolical enterprise without giving them time for calm, sober reflection, and when appeals to passion and prejudice failed, the halter and the opprobrious epithets of abolitionist, submissionist, and Lincolnite were applied without stint to compel recusants into submission and to silence all opposition. I know what I affirm, for I was in the midst of it.

But some of the cotton states and the border states, though shaken, refused to embark their fortunes on board the new and suspicious-looking craft that had appeared in Southern waters, lest it should be carried down by the storm that seemed to be gathering. There seemed to be a lull in the storm and danger that a sober second thought of the people would reverse all these proceedings. Some thing must be done to fire the Southern heart, carry the border and other cotton states, and alarm and intimidate the North, and compel them to acquiesce in the demands of the South. It was proclaimed that blood must be drawn, that the rights of the South

must be baptized in blood, to fire the Southern heart and carry all the Southern states into the great secession movement.

Means had long been in process for this purpose, and on the 12th of April, 1861, a vast armament at Charleston attacked a small, starving garrison of seventy men in Fort Sumter, commanded by the immortal Major (now General) Anderson. Gallant was the defense made by that little band of immortal heroes against overwhelming odds; but, with the fort in ruins and all on fire, they were compelled to lower the flag of their country to rebels; but, in consideration of their gallantry, they were permitted to bear away with them that flag and their arms. The garrison surrendered the 14th day of April—the intelligence was borne on the wires to Montgomery, Alabama, the then seat of government of the so-called Southern Confederacy. Jeff. Davis was indisposed, and Walker, the Secretary of War, from the gallery of the State House, in a short speech, congratulated his hearers on the success of the South, and told them that before the first of May the Confederate flag would be flying over the dome of the Capitol in Washington, and that they would dictate terms of peace in Faneuil Hall in Boston.

One of the ends intended to be gained by this blow is partially accomplished. The Southern maelstrom, that had engulfed so many states, is again

stirred with a strange and unearthly power. Virginia, Tennessee, and Arkansas are lifted from their moorings by a vast wave of the roaring, raging whirlpool, and, borne away on the bosom of the re-fluent tide, are hurled headlong into the dreadful vortex of the rebellion. The old North State yet lingers, but slowly and fatally drifts until it too is ingulfed. The waves break with terrific fury over Maryland and Kentucky—many of their respective crews are swept overboard and ingulfed, but the brave old barks remain fast to their moorings. The wild, roaring waves and the howling tempest break with yet greater fury over Missouri. The pilot and many of the crew are swept overboard and hurled into the vortex of the rebellion; and when a vast wave of the dreadful whirlpool, and a heavy gust of the roaring tempest would strike the sides of the gallant old bark, and sweep with violence over her deck, starting her bolts and making all her bulwarks creak, the crew would look with blank dismay into each other's countenances, and sometimes the cry would go round, "She is drifting! we are ingulfed!" but when a pause in the violence of the rushing waves and of the dark, raging tempest gave opportunity for observation, the brave old ship, though shattered and tossed, was seen to be still fast to her moorings.

The storm had been long gathering. The first

bolt had fallen. Stars that till then had continued to shine in our political canopy, are suddenly darkened by the yet gathering and increasing clouds of war that now darken the whole horizon of the South, and madly roll and toss in the Southern heavens. And as they roll their dark and threatening volumes toward the North, darker and yet more dark they grow—portending such a tempest as the world has rarely witnessed, and the like of which I hope America may never be doomed to witness again. It was not until the red, crashing thunder-bolts of war were rending the heavens that the lion of the North was roused from his lair. Terrible was the danger, and terrible was the power of the loyal people of the loyal states, and terrible their firm and resolute resolve to strike for God and their country. Men and money and lives were given without stint to save the country from disruption, and to preserve the priceless heritage of American freedom. The result is before the world.

I have done; and if, in the discussion of these questions, I have seemed to go beyond the province of the minister of the sanctuary into foreign territory, it was because those whose cases I have been considering had fled there for refuge, and I had to pursue them to their fastnesses, to show that the defenses behind which they have entrenched themselves are wholly untenable.

Thus have I endeavored, my Christian brethren, to lay before you what I conceive to be your obvious duty in the crisis that is upon you. The case is with you. Discharge your duty to God, to those whose cases I have been considering, to yourselves, to the church and your country, as you shall answer to God.









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 942 5



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 942 5